

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT NEW YORK

----- X  
JEREMY LEVIN and DR. LUCILLE LEVIN, :

Plaintiffs, :

- against - :

BANK OF NEW YORK, JP MORGAN  
CHASE, SOCIETE GENERALE, and  
CITIBANK, :

Defendants. :

Case No. 09 Civ. 5900 (RPP)

**CITIBANK, N.A.’S ANSWER TO  
AMENDED COUNTERCLAIMS  
OF THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANTS  
STEVEN M. GREENBAUM,  
ET AL.**

----- X  
THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, :  
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., SOCIETE :  
GENERALE and CITIBANK, N.A., :

Third-Party Plaintiffs, :

- against - :

STEVEN M. GREENBAUM, STEVEN M. :  
GREENBAUM (as administrator of the estate of :  
JUDITH GREENBAUM), ALAN D. :  
HAYMAN, SHIRLEE HAYMAN, *et al.*, :

Third-Party Defendants. :

----- X  
Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff Citibank, N.A. (“Citi”), by its undersigned attorneys, Davis  
Wright Tremaine LLP, submits its answer to the amended counterclaims asserted by third-party  
defendants Steven M. Greenbaum, et al., (the “Greenbaum Judgment Creditors”) and states as  
follows (with paragraph numbers commencing with the first paragraph of the counterclaims):

**COUNTERCLAIMS**

43. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 43 constitute legal conclusions as  
to which no response is required, except that, if a response is required, denies knowledge and  
information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein.

**PARTIES**

44. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 44, except states that a judgment was entered in the case entitled *Steven M. Greenbaum, et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran, et al.*, Civil Action No. 02-2148 (RCL) (D.D.C.).

45. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 45.

46. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 46.

47. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 47.

48. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 48.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

49. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 49 constitute legal conclusions as to which no response is required, except that, if a response is required, denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein.

50. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 50 constitute legal conclusions as to which no response is required, except that, if a response is required, denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein.

**ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTERCLAIMS**

51. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 51, except admits on information and belief that the Greenbaum Judgment Creditors obtained a judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1605A in the amount of \$19,879,923.00 against judgment debtors the Islamic Republic of Iran (“Iran”) and the Iranian Ministry of Information and Security (“MOIS”) (the “Greenbaum Judgment”).

52. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 52.

53. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 53.

54. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 54, except admits that on or about February 3, 2009, Citi served on counsel for the Greenbaum Judgment Creditors its Objections and Responses to Information Subpoena and refers to that document for a true and complete recitation of the contents thereof.

55. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 55.

56. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 56.

57. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 57, except admits that Citi was served on or about April 15, 2010 with a writ of execution with respect to the Acosta Judgment Creditors and refers to that writ for a true and complete recitation of the contents thereof.

58. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 58.

59. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 59.

60. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 60 and refers to the Third-Party Complaint for a true and complete recitation of the contents thereof.

61. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 61.

**FIRST COUNTERCLAIM**

62. Citi incorporates its responses to paragraphs 43 through 61 as though fully set forth herein.

63. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 63, except admits that the Greenbaum Judgment Creditors obtained the Greenbaum Judgment.

64. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 64.

65. Denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 65, except admits that Citi holds certain assets blocked pursuant to Executive Orders issued by the President of the United States and blocking regulations issued by the United States Department of the Treasury and refers to those Orders and regulations for a true and complete recitation of the contents thereof.

66. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 66 constitute legal conclusions as to which no response is required, and refers to the statutes and rules cited in Paragraph 66 for a true and complete recitation of the contents thereof.

**SECOND COUNTERCLAIM**

67. Citi incorporates its responses to paragraphs 43 through 66 as though fully set forth herein.

68. Admits that the language cited in Paragraph 68 appears in the Section 201(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act and refers to that Section of that Act for a true and complete recitation of the contents thereof.

69. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 69 constitute legal conclusions as to which no response is required, except that, if a response is required, denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein.

70. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 70 constitute legal conclusions as to which no response is required, except that, if a response is required, denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein.

71. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 71 constitute legal conclusions as to which no response is required, except that, if a response is required, denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein.

72. States that the allegations contained in Paragraph 72 constitute legal conclusions as to which no response is required, except that, if a response is required, denies knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Without assuming the burden of proof or the burden of persuasion on any matters where the burden rests on the Acosta Judgment Creditors as counterclaim plaintiffs, Citi asserts the following affirmative and other defenses with respect to the Complaint.

73. Citi incorporates its responses to paragraphs 43 through 72 as though fully set forth herein.

### **FOR ITS FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

74. Persons other than the Islamic Republic of Iran or its agencies or instrumentalities may have ownership or other interests in part or all of the assets blocked by Citi that are the subject of this action (the "Blocked Assets") which may be superior to the rights of the Acosta Judgment Creditors to enforce their judgment against the Blocked Assets.

**FOR ITS SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

75. The Blocked Assets sought by Acosta Judgment Creditors in this action include wire transfers that were routed through Citi as an intermediary bank but that could not be completed because they were blocked pursuant to an Executive Order or regulations administered by OFAC. Citi simply blocks any property or accounts that it is directed to block by such Executive Orders or regulations. Because under New York law, wire funds in the temporary possession of Citi as an intermediary bank are not the property of the originator, the ordering bank or the beneficiary, they are not subject to attachment and turn over. *See The Shipping Corp. of India Ltd. v. Jaldi Overseas Pte Ltd.*, 585 F.3d 58, 70-71 (2d Cir. 2009), *cert denied*, 2010 U.S. Lexis 2362 (U.S. Mar. 22, 2010).

**FOR ITS THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

76. The Blocked Assets sought by the Acosta Judgment Creditors in this action may be subject to competing claims by other holders of final judgments against the Islamic Republic of Iran or its agencies and instrumentalities, or plaintiffs in other actions with claims against them who have served Liens of Lis Pendens or other notices of restraint or attachment, including but not limited to judgment holders or plaintiffs in *Levin v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 05-2494 (D.D.C.); *Peterson v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 01-2094, 01-2684 (D.D.C.); *Greenbaum v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 02-2148 (D.D.C.); *Rubin v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 01-1655 (D.D.C.); *Valore v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 03-1959 (D.D.C.); *Bonk v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 08-1273 (D.D.C.); *Estate of James Silvia v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 06-750 (D.D.C.); *Estate of Anthony K. Brown v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 08-531 (D.D.C.); and *Estate of Stephen B. Bland v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case No. 05-2124 (D.D.C.); *Estate of Michael Heiser v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, Case Nos. 00-2329 and 01-2104 (D.D.C.); *Khaliq v. Republic of Sudan, et al.*, Case No. 08-1273 (D.D.C.); *Owens v. Republic of*

*Sudan, et al.*, Case No. 08-1273 (D.D.C.); and *Mwila v. Islamic Republic of Sudan, et al.*, Case No. 08-1377 (D.D.C.). One or more of these judgment holders have already served writs of execution and/or restraining orders on Citi prior to this action and/or have served an answer to the third-party complaint served on them in this action.

**FOR ITS FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

77. To the extent the Acosta Judgment Creditors seek assets in this action that are located outside the United States, such assets are immune from attachment and execution in New York under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1610(a) which authorizes execution against property of a foreign state under certain circumstances which is located “in the United States.” See *Aurelius Capital Partners, LP v. The Republic of Argentina*, 584 F.3d 120, 129-30 (2d Cir. 2009) (“section 1610(a) . . . authorizes execution against property of a foreign state located in the United States”).

**FOR ITS FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

78. To the extent that the Acosta Judgment Creditors seek to enforce their rights under TRIA § 201, the Acosta Judgment Creditors must establish all of the elements necessary to obtain relief under that statute.

**FOR ITS SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

79. To the extent that the Acosta Judgment Creditors seek to enforce their rights under Section 1605(a) of FSIA, the Acosta Judgment Creditors must establish all of the elements necessary to obtain relief under that statute.

**FOR ITS SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

80. Pursuant to the Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferators Sanctions Regulations (31 C.F.R. §§ 544.101 et seq.) and the Global Terrorism Sanctions Regulations (31 C.F.R. §§ 594.101 et seq.) (collectively the “Regulations”), and designations issued by OFAC thereunder, and the various Executive orders underlying those regulations, Citi is and has been prohibited from

transferring any property and assets held in which any person designated under the Regulations has an interest, except pursuant to a license issued by OFAC. Citi therefore seeks a determination from the Court that the Acosta Judgment Creditors can satisfy their judgment against the Islamic Republic of Iran by attaching and obtaining a turnover of assets and/or accounts in which Iran has an interest, directly or indirectly.

WHEREFORE, Citibank N.A. "Citi" respectfully requests the entry of judgment:

(1) determining its rights and the rights of the Acosta Judgment Creditors and of all other defendants and third-party defendants in the Blocked Assets;

(2) determining that the service made by third-party plaintiffs of the third-party complaint, the third-party summons and other relevant documents on the Acosta Judgment Creditors constitutes good and sufficient service under CPLR §5239 and any other applicable provision of law;

(3) determining that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction and *in personam* and/or *in rem* jurisdiction over the Acosta Judgment Creditors or the Blocked Assets sufficient to determine the parties' rights with respect to such assets;

(4) determining whether and to what extent each of the Blocked Assets is subject to execution to satisfy the Levins judgment and/or the Acosta Judgment;

(5) discharging Citi from any and all liability to the Acosta Judgment Creditors, and any other persons who may have claims to, or an interest in, any blocked assets that are turned over to the Levins, the Acosta Judgment Creditors or any other third-party defendant to satisfy the Levins judgment or the Acosta Judgment or any other judgment against Iran;

(6) awarding to Citi its costs and expenses in this proceeding, including reasonable attorneys' fees; and

(7) awarding to Citi such other and further relief as may be just and proper.



Dated: New York, New York  
March 29, 2011

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Sharon L. Schneier

Christopher J. Robinson

1633 Broadway

New York, New York 10019

(212) 489-8230

*Attorneys for Defendant/Third-Party*

*Plaintiff Citibank, N.A.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Megan Duffy, hereby certify that on the 29th day of March, 2011, I caused to be served by ECF, a true and correct copy of the accompanying Citibank, N.A.'s Answer to Amended Counterclaims of Third-Party Defendants Steven M. Greenbaum, et al., dated March 29, 2011, upon the following:

Don Howarth  
Suzelle M. Smith  
Kathryn Lee Crawford  
Howarth and Smith (LA)  
523 West Sixth Street, Suite 728  
Los Angeles, CA 90014  
[nkhoury@howarth-smith.com](mailto:nkhoury@howarth-smith.com)  
[ssmith@howarth-smith.com](mailto:ssmith@howarth-smith.com)

Curtis Campbell Mechling  
Jeremy Sage Rosof  
James L. Bernard  
Benjamin Weathers-Lowin  
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP  
180 Maiden Lane  
New York, NY 10038  
[emechling@stroock.com](mailto:emechling@stroock.com)  
[jrosos@stroock.com](mailto:jrosos@stroock.com)

Mark Hanchet  
Christopher James Hought  
Mayer Brown LLP  
1675 Broadway  
New York, NY 10019  
[mhanchet@mayerbrown.com](mailto:mhanchet@mayerbrown.com)  
[chought@mayerbrown.com](mailto:chought@mayerbrown.com)

George Michael Chalos  
Kerri Marie D'Ambrosio  
Chalos & Co., P.C.  
123 South Street  
Oyster Bay, NY 11771  
[gms@chaloslaw.com](mailto:gms@chaloslaw.com)

Howard B. Levi  
J. Kelley Nevling, Jr.  
Levi Lubarsky & Feigenbaum LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10036  
[hlevi@llf-law.com](mailto:hlevi@llf-law.com)  
[knevling@llf-law.com](mailto:knevling@llf-law.com)

Noel J. Nudelman  
Heidemann Nudelman and Kalik, PC  
1146 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20036  
[njnudelman@hnklaw.com](mailto:njnudelman@hnklaw.com)  
[trkalik@hnklaw.com](mailto:trkalik@hnklaw.com)

George F. Hritz  
Hogan & Hartson LLP  
875 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
[george.hritz@hoganlovells.com](mailto:george.hritz@hoganlovells.com)  
[marie.ferrara@hoganlovells.com](mailto:marie.ferrara@hoganlovells.com)  
[tu.nguyen@hoganlovells.com](mailto:tu.nguyen@hoganlovells.com)

Jeffrey Lance Nagel  
Terry Alan Myers  
Gibbons P.C. (NY)  
One Pennsylvania Plaza  
37<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10119  
[tmyers@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:tmyers@gibbonslaw.com)  
[ckaplan@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:ckaplan@gibbonslaw.com)  
[jnagel@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:jnagel@gibbonslaw.com)  
[lduignan@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:lduignan@gibbonslaw.com)  
[psaso@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:psaso@gibbonslaw.com)

Liviu Vogel  
Salon Marrow Dyckman Newman Broudy LLP  
292 Madison Avenue  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
[lvogel@salonmarrow.com](mailto:lvogel@salonmarrow.com)

Robert Joseph Tolchin  
225 Broadway  
24<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10007  
[rjt@tolchin.com](mailto:rjt@tolchin.com)


John Joseph Hay  
Salans  
620 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10020  
[jhay@salans.com](mailto:jhay@salans.com)  
[cblackwell@salans.com](mailto:cblackwell@salans.com)  
[dgerlach@salans.com](mailto:dgerlach@salans.com)  
[apabona@salans.com](mailto:apabona@salans.com)

Cary B. Samowitz  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10020-1104  
[Cary.samowitz@dlapiper.com](mailto:Cary.samowitz@dlapiper.com)

Jonathan G. Kortmansky  
Sullivan & Worcester LLP  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10104  
[Jkortmansky@sandw.com](mailto:Jkortmansky@sandw.com)  
[mstein@sandw.com](mailto:mstein@sandw.com)  
[rlombardo@sandw.com](mailto:rlombardo@sandw.com)  
[fvelie@sandw.com](mailto:fvelie@sandw.com)


Richard M. Kremen  
Dale K. Cathell  
David B. Misler  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
6225 Smith Avenue  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
[Richard.kremen@dlapiper.com](mailto:Richard.kremen@dlapiper.com)  
[Dale.cathell@dlapiper.com](mailto:Dale.cathell@dlapiper.com)  
[David.misler@dlapiper.com](mailto:David.misler@dlapiper.com)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Megan C. Duffy

Sworn to before me this  
29<sup>th</sup> of March 2011



Notary Public

LINDA G. MOSCHETTI  
Notary Public, State of New York  
No. 01MO4723235  
Qualified in Bronx County  
Term Expires August 31, 2014